

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION

Travis Jamaal Robinson,

Plaintiff,

v.

Christopher Prinz; Rock Hill Police  
Department,

Defendants.

C/A No. 0:23-cv-5351-SAL

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Travis Jamaal Robinson, a pro se plaintiff, filed this civil action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against the Rock Hill Police Department (“RHPD”) and one of its police officers, Christopher Prinz, for injuries arising out of Defendant Prinz’s arrest of Plaintiff on February 19, 2022. This matter is before the court on the Report and Recommendation (the “Report”) issued by United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), recommending summary dismissal of the RHPD. [EFC No. 11.] Attached to the Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. *Id.* at 5. Plaintiff has continued to prosecute this case as to Defendant Prinz, but he has not filed objections to the Report, nor has he otherwise addressed the recommended dismissal of RHPD in his subsequent filings, and the time for doing so has expired.

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The court is charged with making a

*de novo* determination of only those portions of the Report that have been specifically objected to, and the court may accept, reject, or modify the Report, in whole or in part. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of objections, the court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the Report and must “only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

After reviewing the Report, the applicable law, and the record of this case in accordance with the above standard, the court finds no clear error, adopts the Report, ECF No. 11, and incorporates it by reference herein. As a result, the RHPD is **SUMMARILY DISMISSED without prejudice and without issuance of service of process**. This matter remains with the magistrate judge as it pertains to Defendant Prinz.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

March 25, 2024  
Columbia, South Carolina

  
Sherri A. Lydon  
United States District Judge